

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 were examined. In the Office Action, Claims 6-9 and 11 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, without acceding to the correctness of the Patent Office's positions, and in the interest of furthering prosecution of the application, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to include the limitations of Claim 6 and intervening Claims 4 and 5. As a result, Claims 4-6 have been cancelled. In addition, Claims 7, 9, 10 and 13 were amended to change the dependencies from the cancelled claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: July 5, 2006

/Michele J. Young/
Michele J. Young, Reg. No. 43,299
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 230-001
Dd: 4/5/2006